arXiv:1703.05109v1 [stat.ME] 15 Mar 2017

Quantile Treatment Effects in the Regression Kink Design

Harold D. Chiang* Yuya Sasaki†

Johns Hopkins University

March 16, 2017

Abstract

This paper studies identification, estimation, and inference of quantile treatment effects in the fuzzy regression kink design with a binary treatment variable. We first show the identification of conditional quantile treatment effects given the event of local compliance. We then propose a bootstrap method of uniform inference for the local quantile process. This bootstrap method is fast and is robust against common optimal choices of bandwidth parameters. We provide practical guidelines as well as a formal theory. Simulation studies show accurate coverage probabilities for tests of uniform treatment significance and treatment heterogeneity.

Keywords: bootstrap, quantile treatment effects, regression kink design.

*hchiang7@jhu.edu. Department of Economics, Johns Hopkins University.

†sasaki@jhu.edu. Department of Economics, Johns Hopkins University.

1 Introduction

Theories for the regression kink design are advanced by a few papers in the recent literature. Card, Lee, Pei, and Weber (2016) propose identification of average effects of continuous treatments, Dong (2016) proposes identification of average effects of binary treatments, and Chiang and Sasaki (2016) propose identification of quantile effects of continuous treatments. To date, no theories have been proposed for identification of quantile effects of discrete treatments in the regression kink design, despite its relevance to empirical research. This paper aims to fill this void in the literature.

Specifically, in the regression kink design with binary treatments, we show that a local Wald ratio of derivatives of some conditional expectation functions can be used to identify the conditional distributions of the potential outcomes given the event of local compliance. These conditional distributions can be used in turn to identify the quantile treatment effects given the event of local compliance. Our identification argument parallels that of Frandsen, Frölich, and Melly (2012) who show that a local Wald ratio can be used to identify the conditional quantile treatment effects given the event of local compliance in the context of the regression discontinuity design. Because of the lack of discontinuity in our context of the regression kink design, however, our identification result entails the limit case of the event of local compliance, which amounts to the subpopulation of the marginal treatment effects. This is analogous to, and provides a quantile counterpart of the identification result by Dong (2016).

In addition to the causal interpretation result, we also aim to contribute to the method of empirical practice by developing a robust bootstrap method of inference for quantile treatment effects based on an estimator of the local Wald ratio. We propose a multiplier bootstrap method, and show its uniform validity across quantiles, which can be used in turn to conduct tests of uniform treatment significance and treatment heterogeneity among others. This method enjoys robustness against common choices of bandwidths, such as the approximate MSE-optimal ones, by incorporating the bias correction approach of Calonico, Cattaneo and Titiunik (2014) into our bootstrap framework. In the context of sharp designs, Qu and Yoon (2015) develop an alternative method of robust bootstrap for quantile

treatment effects. Our multiplier bootstrap method works even for fuzzy designs, which we focus on throughout this paper.

We conduct simulation studies to evaluate finite-sample performances of the proposed method of inference. The simulation results demonstrate accurate coverage probabilities for tests of both uniform treatment nullity (against the alternative of treatment significance) and treatment homogeneity (against the alternative of treatment heterogeneity).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we develop the identification result. In Section 3, we provide an informal overview of the method of inference. In Section 4, we develop formal theories for the method of inference. In Section 5, we present additional practical considerations, such as (uniformly) consistent first-stage estimators as well as bandwidth choice. In Section 6, we present simulation studies. The paper is summarized in Section 7.

2 Identification

We model the random vector $(Y, D, X, U, V) : (\Omega^x, \mathscr{F}^x, \mathbb{P}^x) \to \mathscr{Y} \times \mathscr{D} \times \mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{U} \times \mathscr{V}$ through the following causal structure, where $\mathscr{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\mathscr{D} = \{0, 1\}$, $\mathscr{X} \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_U}$ for $d_U \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathscr{V} \subset \mathbb{R}$.

$$Y = g(D, X, U) \tag{2.1}$$

$$D = \mathbb{1}\{h(X) \geq V\} \tag{2.2}$$

In (2.1), the outcome variable Y is produced through g by a binary treatment variable D, a continuous running variable or assignment variable X, and miscellaneous factors U. We let $Y^d = g(d, X, U)$ denote the potential outcome random variable that an individual with attributes (X, U) would produce under each hypothetical treatment choice $d \in \{0, 1\}$. The actual treatment choice D is determined by X and V through the threshold crossing model (2.2). A researcher observes the joint distribution of Y, D, and X. However, a researcher cannot observe U or V. We do *not* impose any statistical independence condition in this model. In particular, we do *not* assume statistical independence between X and

(U, V). Instead, we make the following assumption of the regression kink design (RKD).

Assumption 1 (Regression Kink Design, RKD)**.** *Let $x_0 = 0 \in \mathscr{X}$ be a designed kink location.*

(i) h is contiuously differentiable in a deleted neighborhood $I_X \backslash \{0\} \subset \mathscr{X}$ of $x_0 = 0$.

(ii) h is continuous at $x_0 = 0$.

(iii) $\lim_{x \downarrow 0} h'(x) \neq \lim_{x \uparrow 0} h'(x)$, where h' denotes dh/dx.

(iv) The conditional distribution of V given X is absolutely continuous with a continuously differentiable conditional density function $f_{V|X}(\cdot|\cdot)$.

(v) The conditional cumulative distribution function $F_{Y^d|VX}(y|\cdot,\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable for each $y \in \mathscr{Y}$ for each $d \in \{0, 1\}$.

(vi) $f_{V|X}(h(0)|0) > 0$.

The research design as required by Assumption 1 consists of three broad pieces. First, the treatment assignment rule h has a kink at the designed location $x_0 = 0$, as formally stated in (iii), but this rule h is reasonably smooth otherwise, as formally stated in (i) and (ii). Second, every other function is reasonably smooth, as formally stated in (iv) and (v). Third, there is sufficient data at the designed location $x_0 = 0$, as formally stated in (vi). This assumption is analogous to that of Dong (2016) who analyzes average effects of binary treatments in the regression kink design. Under this design, we obtain the following identification result for conditional distributions of the potential outcomes Y^d given the event $(V, X) = (h(0), 0)$.

Theorem 1 (Identification)**.** *Let Assumption 1 hold for the model (2.1)–(2.2). Then*

$$F_{Y^1|VX}(y|h(0),0) = \frac{\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} E[\mathbb{1}\{Y \leq y\} \cdot D | X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} E[\mathbb{1}\{Y \leq y\} \cdot D | X = x]}{\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} E[D|X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} E[D|X = x]} \quad \textit{and}$$

$$F_{Y^0|VX}(y|h(0),0) = \frac{\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} E[\mathbb{1}\{Y \leq y\} \cdot (1-D) | X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} E[\mathbb{1}\{Y \leq y\} \cdot (1-D) | X = x]}{\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} E[1-D|X = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} E[1-D|X = x]}$$

hold for all $y \in \mathscr{Y}$.

Once the conditional CDFs, $F_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0), 0)$ for $d \in \{0, 1\}$, are identified through the formulas

presented in Theorem 1, the conditional quantile treatment effect is in turn identified by

$$\tau(\theta) = \inf\{y \in \mathscr{Y} : F_{Y^1|VX}(y|h(0),0) \geq \theta\} - \inf\{y \in \mathscr{Y} : F_{Y^0|VX}(y|h(0),0) \geq \theta\} \tag{2.3}$$

for $\theta \in (0,1)$. This estimand is the main building block for the method of uniform inference for quantile treatment effects which we will present in the subsequent sections.

Proof of Theorem 1: By applying Leibniz rule under Assumption 1 (i) and (iv), we have

$$\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[D|X=x\right] = \frac{d}{dx}\int_{-\infty}^{h(x)} f_{V|X}(v|x)dv = h'(x)\cdot f_{V|X}(h(x)|x) + \int_{-\infty}^{h(x)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f_{V|X}(v|x)dv$$

for all $x \in I_X\backslash\{0\}$. Similarly, by applying Leibniz rule under Assumption 1 (i), (iv), and (v), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[\mathbb{1}\left\{Y\leq y\right\}\cdot D|X=x\right] =& \frac{d}{dx}\int_{-\infty}^{h(x)}\int_{u:g(1,x,u)\leq y} F_{UV|X}(du,dv|x) \\
=& \frac{d}{dx}\int_{-\infty}^{h(x)} f_{V|X}(v|x)\int_{u:g(1,x,u)\leq y} F_{U|VX}(du|v,x)dv \\
=& \frac{d}{dx}\int_{-\infty}^{h(x)} f_{V|X}(v|x)\cdot F_{Y^1|VX}(y|v,x)dv \\
=& h'(x)\cdot f_{V|X}(h(x)|x)\cdot F_{Y^1|VX}(y|h(x),x) + \\
& \int_{-\infty}^{h(x)} \frac{d}{dx}\left[f_{V|X}(v|x)\cdot F_{Y^1|VX}(y|v,x)dv\right]dv
\end{aligned}$$

for all $(x,y) \in (I_X\backslash\{0\})\times\mathscr{Y}$. Therefore, by Assumption 1 (ii) and (iv), we can write

$$\lim_{x\downarrow 0}\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[D|X=x\right] - \lim_{x\uparrow 0}\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[D|X=x\right] = \left[h'(0^+)-h'(0^-)\right]\cdot f_{V|X}(h(0)|0),$$

and, by Assumption 1 (ii), (iv), and (v), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{x\downarrow 0}\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[\mathbb{1}\left\{Y\leq y\right\}\cdot D|X=x\right] - \lim_{x\uparrow 0}\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[\mathbb{1}\left\{Y\leq y\right\}\cdot D|X=x\right] \\
&= \left[h'(0^+)-h'(0^-)\right]\cdot f_{V|X}(h(0)|0)\cdot F_{Y^1|VX}(y|h(0),0)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $y \in \mathscr{Y}$. Taking the ratio of these expressions under Assumption 1 (iii) and (vi), we obtain

$$\frac{\lim_{x\downarrow 0}\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[\mathbb{1}\left\{Y\leq y\right\}\cdot D|X=x\right] - \lim_{x\uparrow 0}\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[\mathbb{1}\left\{Y\leq y\right\}\cdot D|X=x\right]}{\lim_{x\downarrow 0}\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[D|X=x\right] - \lim_{x\uparrow 0}\frac{d}{dx}\mathrm{E}\left[D|X=x\right]} = F_{Y^1|VX}(y|h(0),0)$$

for all $y \in \mathscr{Y}$. Similar lines of arguments yield

$$\frac{\lim_{x\downarrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} \mathrm{E}\left[\mathbb{1}\left\{Y \leq y\right\} \cdot (1-D) | X = x\right] - \lim_{x\uparrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} \mathrm{E}\left[\mathbb{1}\left\{Y \leq y\right\} \cdot (1-D) | X = x\right]}{\lim_{x\downarrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} \mathrm{E}\left[1-D | X = x\right] - \lim_{x\uparrow 0} \frac{d}{dx} \mathrm{E}\left[1-D | X = x\right]} = F_{Y^0|VX}(y|h(0),0)$$

for all $y \in \mathscr{Y}$. □

Discussions of Theorem 1: In the context of the regression discontinuity design (RDD) where $h(0^-) < h(0^+)$, Frandsen, Frölich, and Melly (2012) show that similar local Wald ratios identify the conditional distribution of the potential outcomes given the event $C_{\mathrm{RDD}} = \{\omega \in \Omega : X(\omega) = 0, h(0^-) < V(\omega) \leq \lim_{x\downarrow 0} h(0^+)\}$ of local compliance. In our context of the regression kink design where $h(0^-) = h(0^+)$, Theorem 1 shows that local Wald ratios of the derivatives identify the conditional distributions of the potential outcomes given the event $C_{\mathrm{RKD}} = \{\omega \in \Omega : X(\omega) = 0, V(\omega) = h(0)\}$, which may be considered as a limit of the event C_{RDD} for RDD as $|h(0^+) - h(0^-)|$ approaches 0. In this sense, our causal interpretation result is similar to that of the marginal treatment effects. This interpretation is analogous to the identification result by Dong (2016) who analyzes average effects of binary treatments in the regression kink design.

3 Methods of Inference: An Overview

In this section, we overview a method of statistical inference for the conditional quantile treatment effects $\tau(\theta)$. Formal theories will be presented in Section 4. The local Wald ratios proposed in Theorem 1 as identifying formulae can be succinctly rewritten as

$$F_{Y^d|VX}(y|h(0),0) = \frac{\mu_1'(0^+,y,d) - \mu_1'(0^-,y,d)}{\mu_2'(0^+,d) - \mu_2'(0^-,d)}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mu_1'(x,y,d)$ and $\mu_2'(x,d)$ are the partial derivatives with respect to x of $\mu_1(x,y,d)$ and $\mu_2(x,d)$ defined by

$$\mu_1(x,y,d) = E[\mathbb{1}\{Y \leq y\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{D = d\} | X = x] \qquad \text{and}$$

$$\mu_2(x,d) = E[\mathbb{1}\{D = d\} | X = x],$$

respectively, where $\delta_i^+ = \mathbb{1}\{X_i > 0\}$, and $\delta_i^- = \mathbb{1}\{X_i < 0\}$. We estimate the components of (3.1) by the one-sided local quadratic estimators

$$\hat{\mu}_1'(0^\pm, y, d) = e_1' \arg\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y\}\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\alpha\Big]^2 K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^\pm \qquad \text{and} \tag{3.2}$$

$$\hat{\mu}_2'(0^\pm, d) = e_1' \arg\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y\} - r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\alpha\Big]^2 K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^\pm, \tag{3.3}$$

where K is a kernel function, h_n is a bandwidth parameter, $e_1 = (0,1,0)'$, and $r(u) = (1, u, u^2)'$. Then, a plug-in estimator for (3.1) is

$$\widehat{F}_{Y^d|VX}(y|h(0),0) = \frac{\hat{\mu}_1'(0^+, y, d) - \hat{\mu}_1'(0^-, y, d)}{\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+, d) - \hat{\mu}_2'(0^-, d)}.$$

We can in turn estimate the conditional quantile treatment effect $\tau(\theta)$ by

$$\hat{\tau}(\theta) = \inf\Big\{y \in \mathscr{Y} : \widehat{F}_{Y^1|VX}(y|h(0),0) \ge \theta\Big\} - \inf\Big\{y \in \mathscr{Y} : \widehat{F}_{Y^0|VX}(y|h(0),0) \ge \theta\Big\} := Q_{Y^1|VX}(\theta) - Q_{Y^0|VX}(\theta)$$

The local Wald estimator $\widehat{F}_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0)$ is not always monotone increasing in finite sample. For ease of implementing the CDF inversion, we monotonize the estimated CDFs by re-arrangements following Chernozhukov, Fernandez-Val, Galichon (2010). This does not affect the asymptotic properties of the estimators, while allowing for inversion of the CDF estimators. Frandsen, Frölich, and Melly (2012) also use this technology in the context of the regression discontinuity design.

Let $\Gamma^\pm = \int_{\mathbb{R}_\pm} r(u)r'(u)K(u)du$. Under the assumptions to be presented in the next section, we obtain the following Uniform Bahadur Representations (BR) for the local slope estimators (3.2) and (3.3).

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_n^\pm(y,d,1) =& \sqrt{nh_n^3}[\hat{\mu}_1'(0^\pm, y, d) - \mu_1'(0^\pm, y, d) + O_p(h_n^2)] \qquad (3.4)\\ =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n} f_X(0)} \sum_{i=1}^n e_1'(\Gamma^\pm)^{-1} r\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y\}\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - \mu_1(X_i, y, d)\Big] K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^\pm\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_n^\pm(y,d,2) =& \sqrt{nh_n^3}[\hat{\mu}_2'(0^\pm, d) - \mu_2'(0^\pm, d) + O_p(h_n^2)] \qquad (3.5)\\ =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n} f_X(0)} \sum_{i=1}^n e_1'(\Gamma^\pm)^{-1} r\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\Big[\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - \mu_2(X_i, d)\Big] K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^\pm\end{aligned}$$

We use the multiplier bootstrap method to approximate the asymptotic distributions of these BR. Draw a random sample $\xi_1, ..., \xi_n$ from the standard normal distribution independently from the data $\{(Y_i, D_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Replacing the unknowns μ_k and $f_X(0)$ in the BR by their uniformly consistent estimators $\tilde{\mu}_k$ and $\hat{f}_X$, respectively, we define the following Estimated Multiplier Processes (EMP).

$$\hat{\nu}^{\pm}_{\xi,n}(y,d,1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}\hat{f}_X(0)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i e_1'(\Gamma^{\pm})^{-1} r\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \leq y\}\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - \tilde{\mu}_1(X_i, y, d)\Big] K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^{\pm} \tag{3.6}$$

$$\hat{\nu}^{\pm}_{\xi,n}(y,d,2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}\hat{f}_X(0)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i e_1'(\Gamma^{\pm})^{-1} r\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\Big[\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - \tilde{\mu}_2(X_i, d)\Big] K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^{\pm}. \tag{3.7}$$

Under the assumptions to be presented in the next section, we show that the EMP can be used to uniformly approximate the asymptotic distribution of the BR. Consequently, by the functional delta method, the asymptotic distribution of

$$\sqrt{nh_n^3}[\hat{\tau}(\cdot) - \tau(\cdot)]$$

can be approximated uniformly on $\Theta = [a, 1-a]$ for $a \in (0, 1/2)$ by the estimated process

$$\widehat{\Xi}(\cdot) = -\left[\frac{\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(\hat{Q}_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot), 1)}{\hat{f}_{Y^1|VX}(\hat{Q}_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot)|h(0), 0)} - \frac{\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(\hat{Q}_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot), 0)}{\hat{f}_{Y^0|VX}(\hat{Q}_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot)|h(0), 0)}\right],$$

where $\hat{Q}_{Y^d|VX}(\theta) = \inf\{y \in \mathscr{Y} : \widehat{F}_{Y^d|VX}(y|h(0), 0) \geq \theta\}$ and

$$\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(y,d) = \frac{[\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+,d) - \hat{\mu}_2'(0^-,d)][\hat{\nu}^+_{\xi,n}(y,d,1) - \hat{\nu}^-_{\xi,n}(y,d,1)] - [\hat{\mu}_1'(0^+,y,d) - \hat{\mu}_1'(0^-,y,d)][\hat{\nu}^+_{\xi,n}(y,d,2) - \hat{\nu}^-_{\xi,n}(y,d,2)]}{[\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+,d) - \hat{\mu}_2'(0^-,d)]^2}.$$

Once we obtain these approximations to the asymptotic distributions, we may conduct various tests following Koenker and Xiao (2002) and Chernozhukov and Fernández-Val (2005). For example for the test of treatment significance, we use the test statistic

$$T^{TS} = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left|\sqrt{nh_n^2}\hat{\tau}(\theta)\right|$$

where $\Theta = [a, 1-a]$ for some $a \in (0, 1/2)$. We approximate the asymptotic distribution of T^{TS} by

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left|\widehat{\Xi}(\theta)\right|.$$

Similarly, for the test of treatment homogeneity, we use the test statistic

$$T^{TH} = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \sqrt{nh_n^3} \left(\hat{\tau}(\theta) - \int_\Theta \hat{\tau}(\vartheta) d\vartheta \right) \right|.$$

We approximate the asymptotic distribution of T^{TH} by

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \left(\widehat{\Xi}(\theta) - \int_\Theta \widehat{\Xi}(\vartheta) d\vartheta \right) \right|.$$

4 Methods of Inference: Theory

We use the following set of assumptions for all the three main results presented in this section: the uniform influence function representation, the bootstrap validity, and consistent first-stage estimation. Fix $a \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, denote $\mathscr{Y}_1 = [Q_{Y^1|VX}(a) - \epsilon, Q_{Y^1|VX}(1-a) + \epsilon] \cup [Q_{Y^0|VX}(a) - \epsilon, Q_{Y^0|VX}(1-a) + \epsilon]$. We will write $a \lesssim b$ if there exists a universal constant C such that $a \leq Cb$. Denote $P_{D|X}(d|x) = \mathbb{P}^x(D = d|X = x)$. We define for any y_1, $y_2 \in \mathscr{Y}_1$, d_1, $d_2 \in \mathscr{D}$

$$\sigma_{11}((y_1, d_1), (y_2, d_2)|x) = E[(\mathbb{1}\{Y \leq y_1, D = d_1\} - \mu_1(X, y_1, d_1))(\mathbb{1}\{Y \leq y_2, D = d_2\} - \mu_1(X, y_2, d_2))|X = x]$$

$$\sigma_{22}((y_1, d_1), (y_2, d_2)|x) = E[(\mathbb{1}\{D = d_1\} - \mu_2(X, d_1))(\mathbb{1}\{D = d_2\} - \mu_2(X, d_2))|X = x]$$

$$\sigma_{12}((y_1, d_1), (y_2, d_2)|x) = E[(\mathbb{1}\{Y \leq y_1, D = d_1\} - \mu_1(X, y_1, d_1))(\{D = d_2\} - \mu_2(X, d_2))|X = x]$$

Assumption 2. *Let $[\underline{x}, \overline{x}]$ be a compact interval containing 0 in its interior. Let $a \in (0, 1/2)$.*

(i) (a) $\{Y_i, D_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are n independent copies of random vector (Y, D, X) with support $\mathscr{Y} \times \mathscr{D} \times \mathscr{X}$ defined on a probability space $(\Omega^x, \mathscr{F}^x, \mathbb{P}^x)$. (b) X has a continuously differentiable density function f_X with $0 < f_X(0) < \infty$. (c) $f_{YD|X}(y, d|x)$ is well-defined on $\mathscr{Y}_1 \times \mathscr{D} \times ([\underline{x}, \overline{x}] \setminus \{0\})$ and $|f_{YD|X}(y, d|0^+) - f_{YD|X}(y, d|0^-)| > m > 0$ on $\mathscr{Y}_1 \times \mathscr{D}$.

(ii)(a) Conditional density $f_{Y|XD}$ is Lipschitz continuous on $\mathscr{Y}_1 \times [\underline{x}, 0)$ and $\mathscr{Y}_1 \times (0, \overline{x}]$ for each d and is three-time partially differentiable in x and twice partially differentiable in y for each d. $\frac{\partial^j}{\partial x^j} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial y^k} f_{Y|XD}(\cdot|\cdot, d)$ is continuous and uniformly bounded on $\mathscr{Y}_1 \times [\underline{x}, 0)$ and $\mathscr{Y}_1 \times (0, \overline{x}]$ for each d for all j, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $j + k \leq 3$. (b) $P_{D|X}(d|\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous in x, three-time differentiable on $[\underline{x}, 0)$

and $(0, \overline{x}]$ *for each* d. $\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} P_{D|X}(d|\cdot)$ *is continuous and uniformly bounded on* $[\underline{x}, 0)$ *and* $(0, \overline{x}]$ *for each* d. *(c) For any* y_1, $y_2 \in \mathscr{Y}_1$, d_1, $d_2 \in \mathscr{D}$, *we have* $\sigma_{11}((y_1, d_1), (y_2, d_2)|\cdot)$, $\sigma_{12}((y_1, d_1), (y_2, d_2)|\cdot)$ *and* $\sigma_{22}((y_1, d_1), (y_2, d_2)|\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^1([\underline{x}, \overline{x}] \subset \{0\})$.

(iii) The bandwidths satisfy $h_n \to 0$, $nh_n^3 \to \infty$, $nh_n^7 \to 0$, $0 < h_n \leq h_0$ *for some finite* h_0.

(iv) (a) $K : [-1, 1] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *is bounded and* $\int_{\mathbb{R}} K(u)du = 1$. *(b)* $\{K(\cdot/h) : h > 0\}$ *is of VC type. (c)* $\Gamma^{\pm} = \int_{\mathbb{R}_\pm} r(u)r'(u)K(u)du$ *are positive definite.*

(v) $\hat{f}_X(0)$ *is a consistent estimator for* $f_X(0)$. *For* $d = 0, 1$, $\hat{f}_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0), 0)$ *are uniformly consistent estimators for* $f_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0), 0)$. *For* $k = 1, 2$, $\tilde{\mu}_k(x, y, d)\mathbb{1}\{|x/h_n| \leq 1\}$ *are uniformly consistent estimators for* $\mu_k(x, y, d)\mathbb{1}\{|x/h_n| \leq 1\}$ *on* $\mathscr{X} \times \mathscr{Y}_1 \times \mathscr{D}$.

(vi) $\{\xi_1, ..., \xi_n\}$ *are* n *independent and identically distributed copies of a standard normal random variable* ξ *defined on a probability space* $(\Omega^\xi, \mathscr{F}^\xi, \mathbb{P}^\xi)$ *that is independent of* $(\Omega^x, \mathscr{F}^x, \mathbb{P}^x)$.

Part (i) concerns about the sampling procedure and the distribution of data. Part (ii) requires smoothness of the conditional expectation functions on a deleted neighborhood of $x = 0$. Part (iii) regulates the rate at which bandwidth decreases, which is consistent with examples of common choice rules to be presented in Section 5.3. Part (iv) is satisfied by common kernel functions, such as uniform, triangular, biweight, triweight, and Epanechnikov kernels, for example. Part (v) is a high-level assumption of (uniformly) consistent estimation of the first-stage estimators. While we keep this high-level statement for the current section, Section 5.2 proposes concrete examples of such uniformly consistent estimators. Part (vi) requires the multiplier random sample to be drawn independently of the data $\{(Y_i, D_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. We remark that part (vi) implies that all (uniformly) consistent estimators with respect to $\mathbb{P}^x$ are also (uniformly) consistent with respect to $\mathbb{P}^{x \times \xi}$.

Under Assumption 2 (i), (ii)(a)(b), (iii), (iv), an application of Lemma 1 of Chiang, Hsu and Sasaki (2017) gives the uniform Bahadur Representation as in equations (3.4) and (3.5). The following theorem establishes (i) (a) the asymptotic distribution of the BR; (i) (b) the asymptotic distribution of the local Wald estimators; (i) (c) the asymptotic distribution of the conditional quantile treatment

effect estimator; and (ii) the bootstrap validity. A proof is provided in Section A.2.

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic Distributions and Bootstrap Validity)**.** *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold.*

(i) (a) $\nu_n^+ - \nu_n^- \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}$ *holds, where* $\mathbb{G}$ *is a zero mean Gaussian process* $\mathbb{G} : \Omega^x \mapsto \ell^\infty(\{\mathscr{Y}_1 \times \mathscr{D} \times \{1,2\}\})$.

(i) (b) $\sqrt{nh_n^3}[\widehat{F}_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0) - F_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0)] \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_F(\cdot,\cdot)$ *holds, where* $\mathbb{G}_F(\cdot,\cdot)$ *is given by*

$$\mathbb{G}_F(y,d) := \frac{[\mu_2'(0^+,d) - \mu_2'(0^-,d)]\mathbb{G}(y,d,1) - [\mu_1'(0^+,y,d) - \mu_1'(0^-,y,d)]\mathbb{G}(y,d,2)}{[\mu_2'(0^+,d) - \mu_2'(0^-,d)]^2}.$$

(i) (c) $\sqrt{nh_n^3}[\hat{\tau} - \tau] \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_\tau$ *holds, where* $\mathbb{G}_\tau$ *is given for each* $\theta \in \Theta = [a, 1-a]$ *by*

$$\mathbb{G}_\tau(\theta) = -\left[\frac{\mathbb{G}_F(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\theta|h(0),0),1)}{f_{Y^1|VX}(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\theta|h(0),0)} - \frac{\mathbb{G}_F(Q_{Y^0|VX}(\theta|h(0),0),1)}{f_{Y^0|VX}(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\theta|h(0),0)}\right].$$

(ii) We have

$$\widehat{\Xi}(\cdot) := -\left[\frac{\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(\hat{Q}_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot),1)}{\hat{f}_{Y^1|VX}(\hat{Q}_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot)|h(0),0)} - \frac{\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(\hat{Q}_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot),0)}{\hat{f}_{Y^0|VX}(\hat{Q}_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot)|h(0),0)}\right] \underset{\xi}{\overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow}} \mathbb{G}_\tau(\cdot)$$

where $\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(\cdot,\cdot)$ *is given for each* $(y,d) \in \mathscr{Y}_1 \times \mathscr{D}$ *by*

$$\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(y,d) = \frac{[\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+,d) - \hat{\mu}_2'(0^-,d)][\hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}^+(y,d,1) - \hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}^-(y,d,1)] - [\hat{\mu}_1'(0^+,y,d) - \hat{\mu}_1'(0^-,y,d)][\hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}^+(y,d,2) - \hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}^-(y,d,2)]}{[\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+,d) - \hat{\mu}_2'(0^-,d)]^2}.$$

5 Additional Practical Considerations

5.1 A Conditional Density Estimator

The statement of Theorem 2 presumes that the densities $f_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0)$ are unknown. In order to simulate the multiplier process, we need to replace them by their uniformly consistent estimators. Note that the identifying formulas in Theorem 1 suggest

$$f_{Y^d|VX}(y|h(0),0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}F_{Y^d|VX}(y|h(0),0) = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mu_1'(0^+,y,d) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mu_1'(0^-,y,d)}{\mu_2'(0^+,d) - \mu_2'(0^-,d)}.$$

Equation (3.3) gives uniformly consistent estimators for the two terms in the denominator. The two terms in the numerator can be written as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mu_1'(0^\pm,y,d) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}E[\mathbb{1}\{Y \le y\}\mathbb{1}\{D = d\}|X = 0^\pm]. \tag{5.1}$$

With bandwidth parameters a_n and b_n, we represent $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mu_1(0^\pm, y, d)$ by the limit of the regularized approximation

$$\mu(0^\pm, y, d) = \lim_{n\to\infty} E\Big[\frac{1}{b_n}K\Big(\frac{Y_i - y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\}\Big|X = 0^\pm\Big], \tag{5.2}$$

and we estimate it by local polynomial

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}'(0^\pm, y, d) =& \frac{1}{a_n}e_1'\Big[\tilde{\mu}(0^\pm, y, d), \tilde{\mu}'(0^\pm, y, d)a_n, \tilde{\mu}''(0^\pm, y, d)\frac{a_n^2}{2}\Big]' \\ =& \frac{1}{a_n}e_1' \arg\min_{\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^3}\sum_{i=1}^n \Big[\frac{1}{b_n}K\Big(\frac{Y_i - y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\alpha\Big]^2 K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\delta_i^\pm. \end{aligned}\tag{5.3}$$

This estimate $\tilde{\mu}'(0^\pm, y, d)$ is used for (5.1). Therefore, $\widehat{f}_{Y^d|VX}(y|h(0), 0)$ is estimated by

$$\hat{f}_{Y^d|VX}(y|h(0), 0) = \frac{\tilde{\mu}'(0^+, y, d) - \tilde{\mu}'(0^-, y, d)}{\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+, d) - \hat{\mu}_2'(0^-, d)}. \tag{5.4}$$

We make the following assumption about the bandwidth parameters a_n and b_n.

Assumption 3. *The bandwidth parameters a_n and b_n satisfy $a_n \to 0$, $b_n \to 0$, and $na_n^2b_n^2 \to \infty$.*

The following lemma shows that the first order derivative of the kernel regularization (5.2) with respect to x are equivalent to the objects (5.1) of interest. We may thus use the estimates of $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mu(0^\pm, y, d)$ to approximate $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mu_1'(0^\pm, y, d)$.

Lemma 1. *Let Assumptions 2 (i) (b), (ii) (a) (b), (iv) (a) and 3 hold. For each $(y, d, x) \in \mathscr{Y} \times \mathscr{D} \times ([\underline{x}, \overline{x}] \setminus \{0\})$,*

(i) $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mu(0^\pm, y, d) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(f_{Y|XD}(y|x, d)P_{D|X}(d|x))$; and

(ii) $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mu_1'(0^\pm, y, d) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}E[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y, D_i = d\}|X_i = x] = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(f_{Y|XD}(y|x, d)P_{D|X}(d|x))$.

A proof is provided in Section A.3. To show the uniform consistency of $\widehat{f}_{Y\cdot|VX}(\cdot|h(0), 0)$, it suffices to show $\sup_{(y,d)\in\mathscr{Y}\times\mathscr{D}}|\tilde{\mu}'(0^\pm, y, d) - \mu'(0^\pm, y, d)| \xrightarrow[x\times\xi]{p} 0$. The following lemma establishes this point.

Lemma 2. *Under Assumption*

$$\sup_{(y,d)\in\mathscr{Y}\times\mathscr{D}}|\tilde{\mu}'(0^\pm, y, d) - \mu'(0^\pm, y, d)| \xrightarrow[x\times\xi]{p} 0$$

A proof is provided in Section A.4.

5.2 First Stage Estimators

We will now give some examples of uniformly consistent estimators that satisfy the high-level condition in Assumption 2 (v). First, the density function of X can be estimated by

$$\hat{f}_X(0) = \frac{1}{nc_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} K(X_i/c_n).$$

This can be shown to be consistent if $c_n \to 0$ and $nc_n \to \infty$, f_X is three-time differentiable and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} f_X(0) < \infty$ – see Theorem 1.1 of Li and Racine (2009).

We now propose first-stage estimators $\tilde{\mu}_1(x,y,d)\mathbb{1}\{|x/h_n| \le 1\}$ and $\tilde{\mu}_2(x,d)\mathbb{1}\{|x/h_n| \le 1\}$ that are used in the EMP. Recall the notations $\delta_x^+ = \mathbb{1}\{x > 0\}$ and $\delta_x^- = \mathbb{1}\{x < 0\}$. We define the first-stage estimators by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mu}_1(x,y,d) =& \Big[\tilde{\mu}_1(0^+,y,d) + \tilde{\mu}_1'(0^+,y,d)x + \tilde{\mu}_1''(0^+,y,d)\frac{x^2}{2}\Big]\delta_x^+ \\
&+ \Big[\tilde{\mu}_1(0^-,y,d) + \tilde{\mu}_1'(0^-,y,d)x + \tilde{\mu}_1''(0^-,y,d)\frac{x^2}{2}\Big]\delta_x^- \qquad \text{and} \\
\tilde{\mu}_2(x,d) =& \Big[\tilde{\mu}_2(0^+,d) + \tilde{\mu}_2'(0^+,d)x + \tilde{\mu}_2''(0^+,d)\frac{x^2}{2}\Big]\delta_x^+ + \Big[\tilde{\mu}_2(0^-,d) + \tilde{\mu}_2'(0^-,d)x + \tilde{\mu}_2''(0^-,d)\frac{x^2}{2}\Big]\delta_x^-,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Big[\tilde{\mu}_1(0^\pm,y,d), \tilde{\mu}_1'(0^\pm,y,d)h_n, \tilde{\mu}_1''(0^\pm,y,d)\frac{h_n^2}{2}\Big]' = \arg\min_{\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y\}\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\alpha\Big]^2 K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^\pm$$

$$\Big[\tilde{\mu}_2(0^\pm,d), \tilde{\mu}_2'(0^\pm,d)h_n, \tilde{\mu}_2''(0^\pm,d)\frac{h_n^2}{2}\Big]' = \arg\min_{\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y\} - r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\alpha\Big]^2 K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^\pm.$$

The uniform consistency of these first-stage estimators, required as the high-level condition in Assumption 2 (v), follows from Lemma 9 of Chiang, Hsu and Sasaki (2017), which is applicable under our Assumption 2 (i)–(iv).

5.3 Bandwidth

Another practical consideration is about a rule for selecting bandwidths in finite sample. We propose to combine the mean-squared-errors (MSE) optimal bandwidths for local linear kernel smoothers and a rule-of-thumb correction for coverage optimality (Calonico, Cattaneo and Farrell, 2016ab). To keep

the implementation simple, we use a single bandwidth h_n that is based on minimizing the sum of MSEs of $\hat{\mu}_1(0^+, y, 1) - \hat{\mu}_1(0^-, y, 1)$ and $\hat{\mu}_1(0^+, y, 0) - \hat{\mu}_1(0^-, y, 0)$ for both of the local quadratic estimation problems. We first introduce short-hand notations. Let $r_1(u) = [1, u]'$, $\Psi_1^{\pm} = \int_{\mathbb{R}_\pm} r_1(u) r_1'(u) K^2(u) du$, $\Gamma_1^{\pm} = \int_{\mathbb{R}_\pm} K(u) r_1(u) r_1'(u) du$, and $\Lambda^{\pm} = \int_{\mathbb{R}_\pm} u^2 r_1(u) K(u) du$. We also define the following conditional variance function

$$\sigma^2(y, d|0^\pm) := \sigma_{11}((y, d), (y, d)|0^\pm) = E[(\mathbb{1}\{Y \leq y, D = d\} - \mu_1(X, y, d))^2 | X = 0^\pm].$$

For the kernel density estimator $\hat{f}_X(0)$, we make use of Silverman's rule of thumb

$$c_n = 1.06 \hat{\sigma}_X n^{-1/5}$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_X$ is the sample standard deviation of $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

For the first-stage bandwidth $h_{0,n}$, we propose the rule

$$h_{0,n} = \left(\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_0'}{C_0^2} \right)^{1/5} n^{-1/5}$$

where the leading bias and variance terms are given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &= e_1' [\frac{(\Gamma_1^+)^{-1} \Lambda^+}{2} \bar{\mu}_+'' - \frac{(\Gamma_1^-)^{-1} \Lambda^-}{2} \bar{\mu}_-''] \qquad \text{and} \\ C_0' &= \frac{e_1' [\bar{\sigma}_+^2 (\Gamma_1^+)^{-1} \Psi_1^+ (\Gamma_1^+)^{-1} + \bar{\sigma}_-^2 (\Gamma_1^-)^{-1} \Psi_1^- (\Gamma_1^-)^{-1}] e_1}{\hat{f}_X(0)}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, with $\bar{\mu}_\pm''$ and $\bar{\sigma}_\pm^2$ given by preliminary estimates of $\mu_1''(0^\pm, y, d)$ and $\sigma^2(y, d|0^\pm)$, respectively, evaluated at certain (y, d) or their averages.

With the first-stage bandwidth $h_{0,n}$ having been selected, we can solve

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big[\check{\mu}_1(0^\pm, y, d), \check{\mu}_1'(0^\pm, y, d) h_{0,n}, \check{\mu}_1''(0^\pm, y, d) \frac{h_{0,n}^2}{2} \Big]' = \\ &\qquad \arg\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \leq y\} \mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_{0,n}}\Big) \alpha \Big]^2 K(X_i / h_{0,n}) \delta_i^\pm, \end{aligned}$$

and thence compute our first-stage level estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mu}_1(x, y, d) = &\Big[\check{\mu}_1(0^+, y, d) + \check{\mu}_1'(0^+, y, d) x + \check{\mu}_1''(0^+, y, d) \frac{x^2}{2} \Big] \delta_x^+ \\ &+ \Big[\check{\mu}_1(0^-, y, d) + \check{\mu}_1'(0^-, y, d) x + \check{\mu}_1''(0^-, y, d) \frac{x^2}{2} \Big] \delta_x^-. \end{aligned}$$

The uniform consistency of this estimator is implied by Lemma 9 of Chiang, Hsu and Sasaki (2017).

We next define the variance estimator by

$$\hat{\sigma}(y,d|0^{\pm}) = \Big(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y, D_i = d\} - \check{\mu}_1(X_i,y,d))^2 K(\frac{X_i}{h_{0,n}})\delta_i^{\pm}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} K(\frac{X_i}{h_{0,n}})\delta_i^{\pm}}\Big)^{1/2},$$

where $\check{\mu}_1(\cdot,y,d)$ is the first stage level estimator given above.

Finally, the main bandwidth selectors are defined by

$$h_n = \left(\frac{3}{2}\frac{C_1'}{C_1^2}\right)^{1/5} n^{-1/4}, \qquad \frac{C_1'}{C_1^2} = \frac{C_1'(\text{med}(Y|D=0),0) + C_1'(\text{med}(Y|d=1),1)}{(C_1(\text{med}(Y|D=0),0) + C_1(\text{med}(Y|D=1),1))^2},$$

where the leading bias and variance terms are given by

$$C_1(y,d) = e_1'\Big[\frac{(\Gamma_1^+)^{-1}\Lambda^+}{2}\check{\mu}_1''(0^+,y,d) - \frac{(\Gamma_1^-)^{-1}\Lambda^-}{2}\check{\mu}_1''(0^-,y,d)\Big] \qquad \text{and}$$
$$C_1'(y,d) = \frac{e_1'[\hat{\sigma}(y,d|0^+)(\Gamma_1^+)^{-1}\Psi_1^+(\Gamma_1^+)^{-1} + \hat{\sigma}(y,d|0^-)(\Gamma_1^-)^{-1}\Psi_1^-(\Gamma_1^-)^{-1}]e_1}{\hat{f}_X(0)},$$

respectively. Here, $\text{med}(Y|D=j)$ denotes the sample median of Y conditional on $D=j$.

6 Simulation Studies

In this section, we use Monte Carlo simulations to evaluate finite-sample performances of the inference method proposed in the previous sections. We use the following data generating process

$$Y = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot X + \alpha_2 \cdot X^2 + \beta_1 \cdot D + (\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \cdot D) \cdot U$$

$$D = \mathbb{1}\{2 \cdot \mathbb{1}\{X \ge 0\} \cdot X - X - 1 \ge V\}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} X \\ U \\ V \end{pmatrix} \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} N\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_X^2 & \rho_{XU}\cdot\sigma_X\cdot\sigma_U & \rho_{XV}\cdot\sigma_X\cdot\sigma_V \\ \rho_{XU}\cdot\sigma_X\cdot\sigma_U & \sigma_U^2 & \rho_{UV}\cdot\sigma_V\cdot\sigma_U \\ \rho_{XV}\cdot\sigma_X\cdot\sigma_V & \rho_{UV}\cdot\sigma_U\cdot\sigma_V & \sigma_V^2 \end{pmatrix}\right)$$

with the parameter values given by $\alpha_0 = 1.00$, $\alpha_1 = 0.10$, $\alpha_2 = 0.01$, $\gamma_0 = 1.00$, $\sigma_X = 1.00$, $\sigma_U = 1.00$, $\sigma_V = 1.00$, $\rho_{XU} = 0.50$, $\rho_{XV} = 0.50$, and $\rho_{UV} = 0.50$. The other two parameters, namely β_1 and

γ_1, will be varied throughout simulations. Notice the treatment assignment probability has a kink at $x = 0$. This kink facilitates identification, estimation, and inference for quantile treatment effects by the theoretical discussions presented in the previous sections.

The two parameters, β_1 and γ_1, to which no specific values have been assigned determine the levels and heterogeneity of treatment effects, respectively. In other words, if $\beta_1 = 0$ and $\gamma_1 = 0$, then Monte Carlo coverage probabilities of both the uniform treatment significance test and the treatment heterogeneity test are expected to be about the same as a designed nominal coverage probability. As β_1 moves away from zero, Monte Carlo coverage probability of the uniform treatment significance test is expected to decrease below a designed nominal coverage probability. Similarly, as γ_1 moves away from zero, Monte Carlo coverage probabilities of both the uniform treatment significance test and the treatment heterogeneity test are expected to decrease below a designed nominal coverage probability.

Following the methodology presented in the previous sections, we run simulations each of the sample sizes $n \in \{500, 1000, 2000, 4000\}$ and for each of the alternative values of $\beta_1, \gamma_1 \in \{0.0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5\}$. The number of Monte Carlo replications is 2500, and the number of multiplier bootstrap resampling is also 2500. Table 1 shows results for various values of β_1 while fixing $\gamma_1 = 0$. Table 2 shows results for various values of γ_1 while fixing $\beta_1 = 0$.

In both tables, we see that the acceptance frequencies under $\beta_1 = \gamma_1 = 0$ are around 0.93–0.94 for both of the significance and homogeneity tests, and are reasonably close to the nominal coverage probability of 0.95. Recall that our problem is based on derivatives of nonparametric functions (whose convergence rate is $\sqrt{nh_n^3}$) and their nonlinear transformations. In this light, the displayed acceptance frequencies are considered to be reasonably close to the nominal coverage probability.

7 Summary

In this paper, we show identification, estimation, and inference of quantile treatment effects in the fuzzy regression kink design with a binary treatment variable. For the identification part, we show

that a transformation of a variant of the local Wald ratio of derivatives equals the conditional quantile treatment effects given the event of local compliance. The estimation strategy follows a standard sample-analog nonparametric method. For the inference part, we propose a bootstrap method of uniform inference for the local quantile process. This bootstrap method incorporates a bias-correction approach, and is thus robust against common optimal choices of bandwidth parameters. We provide practical guidelines as well as a formal theory. Simulation studies show accurate coverage probabilities for tests of uniform treatment significance and treatment heterogeneity.

A Mathematical Appendix

A.1 Auxiliary Lemmas

A.1.1 Uniform Uniform Bahadur Representation

The following lemma proposes the uniform BR for the local slope estimators.

Lemma 3 (Chiang, Hsu, and Sasaki, 2016; Lemma 1)**.** *Under Assumption 2, we have the uniform influence function representations (3.4) and (3.5) that hold uniformly on* $\mathscr{Y}_1 \times \mathscr{D}$.

A.1.2 Functional Central Limit Theorem

Lemma 4 (Pollard, 1990; Kosorok 2008)**.** *Let triangular array of separable stochastic processes* $\{f_{ni}(t) : i = 1, ...n, t \in T\}$ *be row independent and write* $\nu_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n [f_{ni}(t) - Ef_{ni}(\cdot, t)]$. *Define* $\rho_n(s,t) = (\sum_{i=1}^n [f_{ni}(s) - f_{ni}(t)]^2)^{1/2}$. *Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied.*

1. $\{f_{ni}\}$ *are manageable, with envelope* $\{F_{ni}\}$ *which are also independent within rows;*

2. $H(s,t) = \lim_{n\to\infty} E\nu_n(s)\nu_n(t)$ *exists for every* $s, t \in T$*;*

3. $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n E^* F_{ni}^2 < \infty$*;*

4. $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n E^* F_{ni}^2 \mathbb{1}\{F_{ni} > \epsilon\} = 0$ *for each* $\epsilon > 0$*;*

5. $\rho(s,t) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \rho_n(s,t)$ *exists for every* $s,t \in T$*, and for all deterministic sequences* $\{s_n\}$ *and* $\{t_n\}$ *in* $\mathbb{D}$*, if* $\rho(s_n,t_n) \to 0$ *then* $\rho_n(s_n,t_n) \to 0$*.*

where E^* *is the outer integral (see, e.g., Section 1.2 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996)). Then* T *is totally bounded under the* ρ *pseudometric and* X_n *converges weakly to a tight mean zero Gaussian process* $\mathbb{G}$ *concentrated on* $UC(T,\rho)$*, with covariance* $H(s,t)$*.*

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Before starting to present a proof of the theorem, we introduce additional definitions and notations for the proof of the theorem. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a class of measurable functions defined on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F})$ with a measurable envelope F. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is of VC type with envelope F if there exist constants A, $v > 0$ such that $\sup_Q N(\mathcal{F}, L^2(Q), \varepsilon \|F\|_{Q,2}) \leq (A/\varepsilon)^v$, where the supremum is taken over the set of all finite discrete measures Q on $\mathcal{F}$.

To approximate the distribution of the BR, we define the following Multiplier Processes (MP).

$$\nu^{\pm}_{\xi,n}(y,d,1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n} f_X(0)} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i e_1'(\Gamma^{\pm})^{-1} r\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \leq y, D_i = d\} - \mu_1(X_i,y,d)\Big] K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^{\pm}$$

$$\nu^{\pm}_{\xi,n}(y,d,2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n} f_X(0)} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i e_1'(\Gamma^{\pm})^{-1} r\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\Big[\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - \mu_2(X_i,d)\Big] K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^{\pm}.$$

For ease of writing, we use the following notations for the differences of right and left limits of the BR, the MP, and the EMP.

$$\nu_n(y,d,k) = \nu_n^+(y,d,k) - \nu_n^-(y,d,k)$$

$$\nu_{\xi,n}(y,d,k) = \nu_{\xi,n}^+(y,d,k) - \nu_{\xi,n}^-(y,d,k)$$

$$\hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}(y,d,k) = \hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}^+(y,d,k) - \hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}^-(y,d,k)$$

With these preparations, we now start a proof of Theorem 2.

Proof.

Part (i) (a): We will verify the five conditions in Lemma 4 for the triangular array of stochastic

processes $\{f_{ni}\}$ defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{ni}(y,d,1) =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}f_X(0)} e_1'(\Gamma^+)^{-1} r\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y\}\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - \mu_1(X_i,y,d)\Big] K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^+ \\
f_{ni}(y,d,2) =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}f_X(0)} e_1'(\Gamma^+)^{-1} r\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\Big[\mathbb{1}\{D_i = d\} - \mu_2(X_i,y,d)\Big] K\Big(\frac{X_i}{h_n}\Big)\delta_i^+ \\
\nu_n^+(y,d,k) =& \sum_{i=1}^n [f_{ni}(y,d,k) - Ef_{ni}(y,d,k)]
\end{aligned}
$$

The separability follows the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4 of Kosorok (2003) and the left or right continuity of the processes. To show condition 1, define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{F}_n =& \{(y',d',x) \mapsto \mathbb{1}\{x \ge 0\}[(\mathbb{1}\{y' \le y, d' = d\} - \mu_1(x,y,d))\mathbb{1}\{k=1\} \\
&+ (\mathbb{1}\{d' = d\} - \mu_2(x,y,d))\mathbb{1}\{k=2\}] : (y,d,k) \in \mathscr{D} \times \{0,1\} \times \{1,2\}\} \\
\mathscr{F}_n' =& \{f_{ni}(y,d,k) : (y,d,k) \in \mathscr{Y}_1 \times \{0,1\} \times \{1,2\}\}
\end{aligned}
$$

We first claim that $\mathscr{F}_n'$ is a VC type class with envelope $F_n(y,d,x) = \frac{C''}{\sqrt{nh_n}} \|K\|_\infty \mathbb{1}\{|x/h_n| \in [-1,1]\}$ for some constant $C'' > 0$. It is clear $\{(y,d,x) \mapsto \mathbb{1}\{y' \le y\} : y \in \mathscr{Y}_1\}$ is of VC-subgraph with VC index ≤ 2 since it is monotone increasing in y, and thus for each pair $(y_1,x_1,d_1,r_1),(y_2,x_2,d_2,r_2) \in \mathscr{Y} \times \mathscr{X} \times \{0,1\} \times \mathbb{R}$ with $y_1 \le y_2$, it can never pick out $\{(y_1,x_1,d_1,r_1)\}$. Similarly, $\{(y,d,x) \mapsto \mathbb{1}\{d = d'\} : d' \in \{1,2\}\}$, $\{(y,d,x) \mapsto \{\mathbb{1}\{k = k'\} : k' \in \{1,2\}\}$ and $\{(y,d,x) \mapsto \mathbb{1}\{x \ge 0\}\}$ are all VC subgraph classes since they are sub-collections of all half spaces and then by Lemma 9.12 (i) of Kosorok (2008). Each of them is therefore of VC type with envelope 1. Next, Assumption 2(ii)(a)(b) imply $|\mu_{k_1}(x,y_1,d_1) - \mu_{k_2}(x,y_2,d_2)| \le L\|(k_1,y_1,d_1) - (k_2,y_2,d_2)\|$ for an $L > 0$ and Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$. Thus $\{x \mapsto \mu_k(x,y',d') : (k,y',d') \in \{1,2\} \times \mathscr{Y}_1 \times \mathscr{D}\}$ is of VC type with envelope L in light of Example 19.7 of van der Vaart (1998) and Lemma 9.18 of Kosorok (2008). Under Assumption 2(i)(b), (iii) and (iv), for each n, the collection of a single function $\{(y,d,x) \mapsto \frac{e_1'(\Gamma^+)^{-1}r(x/h_n)\mathbb{1}\{|x/h_n| \in [-1,1]\}}{\sqrt{nh_n}f_X(0)}\}$ is of VC subgraph and therefore VC type with envelope $\frac{C'\mathbb{1}\{|x/h_n| \in [-1,1]\}}{\sqrt{nh_n}}$. Example 19.19 of van der Vaart (1998) suggests VC type classes, that are of finite uniform integrals, are closed under element-wise

addition and multiplication. Therefore, $\mathscr{F}_n$ is of VC type with envelope constant C'' and thus

$$\mathscr{F}_n' = \{\frac{e_1'(\Gamma^+)^{-1}r(\cdot/h_n)K(\cdot/h_n)}{\sqrt{nh_n}f_X(0)} \cdot f : f \in \mathscr{F}_n\}$$

is of VC type with envelope $F_n(y,d,x) = \frac{C''}{\sqrt{nh_n}} \|K\|_\infty \mathbb{1}\{x/h_n \in [-1,1]\}$. Finally standard calculations show for each n and for any $\delta \in (0,1)$ the uniform entropy integral bound

$$\int_0^\delta \sup_Q \sqrt{1 + \log N(\mathscr{F}_n, L_2(Q), \varepsilon \|F_n\|_{Q,2})}d\varepsilon \lesssim \delta\sqrt{v\log(A/\delta)}.$$

Equation (A.1) in the proof of Theorem 1 in Andrews (1994) then implies that $\mathscr{F}_n'$ is a manageable class of functions, as defined in Section 11.4.1 of Kosorok (2008).

To check condition 2, notice $E\nu_n^+(y_1,d_1,k_1)\nu_n^+(y_2,d_2,k_2) = \sum_{i=1}^n Ef_{ni}(y_1,d_1,k_1)f_{ni}(y_2,d_2,k_2) - (\sum_{i=1}^n Ef_{ni}(y_1,d_1,k_1))(\sum_{i=1}^n Ef_{ni}(y_2,d_2,k_2))$. It suffices to check $\sum_{i=1}^n Ef_{ni}(y_1,d_1,k_1)f_{ni}(y_2,d_2,k_2) < \infty$ since $Ef_{ni}(y,d,k) = 0$ due to the law of iterated expectations and thus the second term is 0. When $k_1 = k_2 = 1$, under Assumption 2(i)(a)(b),(ii)(c),(iii), (iv)(a),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^n Ef_{ni}(y_1,d_1,1)f_{ni}(y_2,d_2,1) \\
=&E[\frac{e_1'(\Gamma^+)^{-1}r(\frac{X_i}{h_n})r'(\frac{X_i}{h_n})(\Gamma^+)^{-1}e_1}{h_nf_X^2(0)}[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y_1, D_i = d_1\} - \mu_1(X_i,y,d_1)] \\
&\qquad \times [\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y_2, D_i = d_2\} - \mu_1(X_i,y,d_2)]K^2(\frac{X_i}{h_n})\delta_i^+] \\
=&\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{e_1'(\Gamma^+)^{-1}r(u)r'(u)(\Gamma^+)^{-1}e_1}{f_X^2(0)}K^2(u)(\sigma_{11}((y_1,d_1),(y_2,d_2)|0^+) + O(uh_n))(f_X(0) + O(h_n))du \\
=&\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{e_1'(\Gamma^+)^{-1}r(u)r'(u)(\Gamma^+)^{-1}e_1}{f_X(0)}K^2(u)\sigma_{11}((y_1,d_1),(y_2,d_2)|0^+)du + O(h_n) < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to the last equality is due to mean value expansions under Assumption 2 (i)(b) and (ii)(c). Notice that n enters only through the big-oh term and thus $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^n Ef_{ni}(y_1,d_1,1)f_{ni}(y_2,d_2,1)$ exists. Similar calculations hold for $k_1 = k_2 = 1$ and $k_1 = 1$, $k_2 = 2$. This shows condition 2.

Condition 3 is clear since $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^n EF_{ni}^2 = \lim_{n\to\infty}\int \frac{(C'')^2}{h_n}\|K\|_\infty^2 \mathbb{1}\{|x/h_n| \in [-1,1]\}f_X(x)dx = f(0)(C'')^2\|K\|_\infty^2 < \infty$ under Assumption 2 (i)(a), (iii) and (iv)(a).

To show condition 4, note that for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} E[F_{ni}^2 \mathbb{1}\{F_{ni} > \varepsilon\}] \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(C'')^2}{h_n} \|K\|_\infty^2 \mathbb{1}\{x/h_n \in [-1,1]\} \mathbb{1}\{\frac{(C'')}{nh_n} \|K\|_\infty \mathbb{1}\{x/h_n \in [-1,1]\} > \varepsilon\} f_X(x) dx \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} (C'')^2 \|K\|_\infty^2 \mathbb{1}\{u \in [-1,1]\} \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{1}\{\frac{(C'')}{nh_n} \|K\|_\infty \mathbb{1}\{u \in [-1,1]\} > \varepsilon\} f_X(0) du + O(h_n) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

under Assumption 2 (i)(a), (iii) and (iv)(a). This shows condition 4.

To show condition 5, note that we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_n^2((y_1,d_1,k_1),(y_2,d_2,k_2)) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} E[f_{ni}(y_1,d_1,k_1) - f_{ni}(y_2,d_2,k_2)]^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} E[f_{ni}^2(y_1,d_1,k_1) + f_{ni}^2(y_2,d_2,k_2) - 2f_{ni}(y_1,d_1,k_1) f_{ni}(y_2,d_2,k_2)].
\end{aligned}$$

From our calculations on the way to show condition 2, we know that each term on the right-hand side exists under Assumption 2 (i)(a)(b),(ii)(c),(iii), (iv)(a). Since n enters the expression only through the $O(h_n)$ part, for all deterministic sequences $s_n \in \mathscr{Y}_1 \times \{0,1\} \times \{1,2\}$ and $t_n \in \mathscr{Y}_1 \times \{0,1\} \times \{1,2\}$, $\rho^2(s_n,t_n) \to 0$ implies $\rho_n^2(s_n,t_n) \to 0$.

By Theorem 11.16 of Kosorok (2008), we have $\nu_n^+ \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_+$ and $\nu_n^- \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_-$. Assumption 2(i)(a) then implies $\nu_n = \nu_n^+ - \nu_n^- \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G} := \mathbb{G}_+ - \mathbb{G}_-$.

Part (i) (b): We apply the FCLT and the functional delta method. Notice that $\nu_n \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}$ suggests

$$\sqrt{nh_n^3} \begin{bmatrix} (\hat{\mu}_1'(0^+,y,d) - \hat{\mu}_1'(0^-,y,d)) - (\mu_1'(0^+,y,d) - \mu_1'(0^-,y,d)) \\ (\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+,d) - \hat{\mu}_2'(0^-,d)) - (\mu_2'(0^+,d) - \mu_2'(0^-,d)) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{G}(y,d,1) \\ \mathbb{G}(y,d,2) \end{bmatrix}$$

Let $(A(\cdot),B(\cdot)) \in \ell^\infty(\mathscr{Y}_1 \times \{0,1\}) \times \ell^\infty(\mathscr{Y}_1)$, if $B(\cdot) > C > 0$, then $(F,G) \overset{\Psi}{\mapsto} F/G$ is Hadamard differentiable at (A,B) tangentially to ℓ^∞ with the Hadamard derivative $\Psi'_{(A,B)}$ given by $\Psi'_{(A,B)}(g,h) = (Bg - Ah)/B^2$. Therefore, under Assumption 1(ii), we know that $\mu_2'(0^+,d) - \mu_2'(0^-,d)$ is bounded away from 0. Also, $f_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0)$ is bounded away from zero under Assumption 2(i)(c). The

functional delta method then yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{nh_n^3}[\widehat{F}_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0) - F_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0)] \\
=&[\frac{\hat{\mu}_1'(0^+,\cdot,\cdot) - \hat{\mu}_1'(0^-,\cdot,\cdot)}{\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+,\cdot) - \hat{\mu}_2'(0^-,\cdot)} - \frac{\mu_1'(0^+,\cdot,\cdot) - \mu_1'(0^-,\cdot,\cdot)}{\mu_2'(0^+,\cdot) - \mu_2'(0^-,\cdot)}] \\
\rightsquigarrow&\mathbb{G}_F(\cdot,\cdot)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbb{G}_F(y,d) := \frac{[\mu_2'(0^+,d) - \mu_2'(0^-,d)]\mathbb{G}(y,d) - [\mu_1'(0^+,y,d) - \mu_1'(0^-,y,d)]\mathbb{G}(y,d,2)}{[\mu_2'(0^+,d) - \mu_2'(0^-,d)]^2}$$

Part (i) (c): Define operator $\Upsilon : \mathbb{D}_\Upsilon(\mathscr{Y}_1 \times \{0,1\}) \to \ell^\infty([a,1-a])$ as

$$F(\cdot,\cdot) \overset{\Upsilon}{\mapsto} \Phi(F)(\cdot,1) - \Phi(F(\cdot,0))(\cdot) = Q(\cdot,1) - Q(\cdot,0)$$

where $\Phi(F)(\theta) = Q(\theta) = \inf\{y \in \mathscr{Y}_1 : F(y) \geq \theta\}$. By Hadamard differentiability from Lemma 3.9.23(ii) of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) and the chain rule (Theorem 20.9 of van der Vaart (1998)), under Assumption 2(i)(c),(ii)(a)(b), Υ is Hadamard differentiable at $F_{Y^\cdot|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0)$ tangentially to $\mathcal{C}(\mathscr{Y}_1 \times \mathscr{D})$ and the derivative

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Upsilon'_{F_{Y^\cdot|VX}(h(0),0)}(g(\cdot,\cdot))(\cdot) \\
=&-\frac{g(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot),1)}{f_{Y^1|VX}(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot)|h(0),0)} + \frac{g(Q_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot),0)}{f_{Y^0|VX}(Q_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot)|h(0),0)}
\end{aligned}$$

is tangential to $C(\mathscr{Y}_1 \times \mathscr{D})$. The functional delta method then yields

$$\sqrt{nh_n^3}[\hat{\tau} - \tau] \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{G}_\tau$$

where

$$\mathbb{G}_\tau(\theta) = -\Big[\frac{\mathbb{G}_F(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\theta),1)}{f_{Y^1|VX}(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\theta)|h(0),0)} - \frac{\mathbb{G}_F(Q_{Y^0|VX}(\theta),1)}{f_{Y^0|VX}(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\theta)|h(0),0)}\Big].$$

Part (ii): This part of the proof consists of two steps. We first show the convergence result for the

MP, and then show the convergence result for the EMP.

Step 1 We claim $\nu_{\xi,n} \overset{p}{\underset{\xi}{\rightsquigarrow}} \mathbb{G}$. Applying Theorem 11.19 of Kosorok (2008), which is applicable under the five conditions verified in (i), we have $\nu_{\xi,n} = \nu^+_{\xi,n} - \nu^-_{\xi,n} \overset{p}{\underset{\xi}{\rightsquigarrow}} \mathbb{G}$. In light of of Lemma 2 of Chiang, Hsu, and Sasaki (2016), it then suffices to show

$$\sup_{(y,d,k)\in\mathscr{Y}_1\times\{0,1\}\times\{1,2\}} |\hat{\nu}^{\pm}_{\xi,n}(y,d,k) - \nu^{\pm}_{\xi,n}(y,d,k)| \xrightarrow[x\times\xi]{p} 0.$$

Indeed, for $k=1$, by Assumption 2(i)(b),(v), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\nu}^+_{\xi,n}(y,d,1) - \nu^+_{\xi,n}(y,d,1)\\
=&\frac{1}{f_X(0)\hat{f}_X(0)}\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \frac{e_1'\Gamma^{-1}r(\frac{X_i}{h_n})K(\frac{X_i}{h_n})\delta_i^+}{\sqrt{nh_n}}[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i\le y, D_i=d\}f_X(0) - \tilde{\mu}_1(0^+,y,d)f_x(0)\\
&-\mathbb{1}\{Y_i\le y, D_i=d\}\hat{f}_X(0) + \mu_1(0^+,y,d)\hat{f}_X(0)]\\
=&\frac{1}{f_X^2(0)+o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}\sum_{i=1}^n T_i[\tilde{\mu}_1(0^+,y,d)f_X(0) - \mu_1(0^+,y,d)\hat{f}_X(0) + o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)]\\
=&\frac{1}{f_X^2(0)+o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}\sum_{i=1}^n T_i[\tilde{\mu}_1(0^+,y,d)f_X(0) - \mu_1(0^+,y,d)f_X(0)\\
&+\mu_1(0^+,y,d)f_X(0) - \mu_1(0^+,y,d)\hat{f}_X(0) + o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)]\\
=&\frac{f_X(0)}{f_X^2(0)+o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}\sum_{i=1}^n T_i[\tilde{\mu}_1(0^+,y,d) - \mu_1(0^+,y,d)] + \frac{\mu_1(0^+,y,d)}{f_X^2(0)+o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}\sum_{i=1}^n T_i[f_X(0)-\hat{f}_X(0)]\\
&+\frac{o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}{f_X^2(0)+o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}\sum_{i=1}^n T_i\\
=&\frac{f_X(0)}{f_X^2(0)+o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}\sum_{i=1}^n T_i o_p^{x\times\xi}(1) + \frac{\mu_1(0^+,y,d)}{f_X^2(0)+o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}\sum_{i=1}^n T_i o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)\\
&+\frac{o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}{f_X^2(0)+o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)}\sum_{i=1}^n T_i\\
=&o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)\sum_{i=1}^n T_i
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where $T_i = \xi_i \frac{e_1'\Gamma^{-1}r(\frac{X_i}{h_n})K(\frac{X_i}{h_n})\delta_i^+}{\sqrt{nh_n}}$. It can be shown that the array of zero mean random variables $\{\sum_{i=1}^n T_i\}_{i=1}^n$ satisfies Lindeberg-Feller conditions (Proposition 2.27 of van der Vaart (1998)) under Assumption 2(i)(a), (iii) and (iv)(a)(c) and therefore converges in distribution to a normal distribution. Therefore, the asymptotic tightness then implies $\sum_{i=1}^n T_i = O_p^{x\times\xi}(1)$. Thus we conclude that equation

A.1 is $o_p^{x\times\xi}(1)$.

Step 2 We will show

$$-[\frac{\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(\hat{Q}_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot),1)}{\hat{f}_{Y^1|VX}(\hat{Q}_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot)|h(0),0)}-\frac{\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(\hat{Q}_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot),0)}{\hat{f}_{Y^0|VX}(\hat{Q}_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot)|h(0),0)}]\overset{p}{\underset{\xi}{\rightsquigarrow}}\mathbb{G}_\tau(\cdot)$$

where

$$\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(y,d)=\frac{[\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+,d)-\hat{\mu}_2'(0^-,d)]\hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}(y,d,1)-[\hat{\mu}_1'(0^+,y,d)-\hat{\mu}_1'(0^-,y,d)]\hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}(y,d,2)}{[\hat{\mu}_2'(0^+,d)-\hat{\mu}_2'(0^-,d)]^2}$$

We first use Theorem 12.1 of Kosorok (2008) (the functional delta for bootstrap) along with the conclusion of Step 1 to get

$$\tilde{Z}_{\xi,n}(\cdot,\cdot):=\frac{[\mu_2'(0^+,\cdot)-\mu_2'(0^-,\cdot)]\hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}(\cdot,\cdot,1)-[\mu_1'(0^+,\cdot,\cdot)-\mu_1'(0^-,\cdot,\cdot)]\hat{\nu}_{\xi,n}(\cdot,\cdot,2)}{[\mu_2'(0^+,\cdot)-\mu_2'(0^-,\cdot)]^2}\overset{p}{\underset{\xi}{\rightsquigarrow}}\mathbb{G}_F(\cdot,\cdot).$$

Since the denominator is bounded away from 0 under Assumption 2(i)(iv), uniform consistency of $\hat{\mu}_1$, $\hat{\mu}_2$ from Assumption 2(v) gives $\left\|\tilde{Z}_{\xi,n}-\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}\right\|_{\mathscr{Y}_1\times\{0,1\}}\underset{x\times\xi}{\overset{p}{\to}}0$, and Lemma 2 of Chiang, Hsu, and Sasaki implies $\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}\overset{p}{\underset{\xi}{\rightsquigarrow}}\mathbb{G}_F$. Using the functional delta method for bootstrap again, we obtain

$$-[\frac{\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot),1)}{f_{Y^1|VX}(Q_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot)|h(0),0)}-\frac{\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(Q_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot),0)}{f_{Y^0|VX}(Q_{Y^0|VX}(\cdot)|h(0),0)}]\overset{p}{\underset{\xi}{\rightsquigarrow}}\mathbb{G}_\tau(\cdot).$$

Since $f_{Y^d|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0)$ are bounded away from zero, using asymptotic $\rho-$equicontinuity of $\hat{Z}_{\xi,n}(\cdot,\cdot)$ following its (conditional) weak convergence and Theorem 3.7.23 of Giné and Nickl (2016), and the uniform consistency of $\hat{f}_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot|h(0),0)$ and $\hat{Q}_{Y^1|VX}(\cdot)$ along with Lemma 2 of Chiang, Hsu and Sasaki (2017), we conclude part (ii) of the theorem. □

A.3 Proof of Lemma 1

(i) For $d = 1$, under Assumptions 2 (i) (b), (ii) (a) (b), (iv) (a) and 3, for each $(y, x) \in \mathscr{Y} \times ([\underline{x}, \overline{x}] \setminus \{0\})$, for $d = 1$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \lim_{n\to\infty} E\Big[\frac{1}{b_n} K\Big(\frac{Y_i - y}{b_n}\Big) \mathbb{1}\{D_i = 1\} | X_i = x\Big] \\
=&\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \lim_{n\to\infty} (E\Big[\frac{1}{b_n} K\Big(\frac{Y_i - y}{b_n}\Big)\Big| X_i = x\Big] P_{D|X}(1|x) + 0) \\
=&\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \lim_{n\to\infty} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} K(u) f_{Y|XD}(ub_n + y|x, 1) du P_{D|X}(1|x)\Big) \\
=&\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \lim_{n\to\infty} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}} K(u)(f_{Y|XD}(y|x, 1) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} f_{Y|XD}(y|x, 1) ub_n + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} f_{Y|XD}(y^*|x, 1) \frac{u^2 b_n^2}{2}) du P_{D|X}(1|x)\Big) \\
=&\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \lim_{n\to\infty} ((f_{Y|XD}(y|x, 1) + O(b_n^2)) P_{D|X}(1|x)) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(f_{Y|XD}(y|x, 1) P_{D|X}(1|x)).
\end{aligned}
$$

where $y*$ lies between y and $y + ub_n$. Similar result holds for $d = 0$.

(ii) Under Assumptions 2 (i) (b), (ii) (a) (b), (iv) (a) and 3, for each $(y, x) \in \mathscr{Y} \times ([\underline{x}, \overline{x}] \setminus \{0\})$, for $d = 1$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} E\Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y, D_i = 1\}\Big| X_i = x\Big] =& \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big(E\Big[\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \le y\}\Big| X_i = x\Big] P_{D|X}(1|x) + 0\Big) \\
=& \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\frac{\partial}{\partial x} F_{Y|XD}(y|x, 1) P_{D|X}(1|x) \\
=& \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\frac{\partial}{\partial y} F_{Y|XD}(y|x, 1) P_{D|X}(1|x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f_{Y|XD}(y|x, 1) P_{D|X}(1|x).
\end{aligned}
$$

Similar result holds for $d = 0$. □

A.4 Proof of Lemma 2

The proof makes use of a new maximal inequality from Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Kato (2014). Under Assumptions 2 (ii) (a) (b) and 3, as in Section 1.6 of Tsybakov (2003), the solution to equation

(5.3) can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\alpha}(0^+, y, d) \\
=&\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big]^{-1}\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{b_n}K\Big(\frac{Y_i-y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i=d\}\Big)\Big] \\
=&\alpha(0^+, y, d) + \Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big]^{-1}\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\frac{\mu'''(x_{ni}^*, y, d)}{3!}a_n^3 \\
+&\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big]^{-1} \\
&\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{b_n}K\Big(\frac{Y_i-y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i=d\} - \mu(X_i, y, d)\Big)\Big]
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\alpha(0^+, y, d) = \Big[\mu(0^{\pm}, y, d), \mu'(0^{\pm}, y, d)a_n, \mu''(0^{\pm}, y, d)\frac{a_n^2}{2}\Big]'$. Multiply both sides by e_1' to get

$$\tilde{\mu}(0^+, y, d) = \mu(0^+, y, d) + (1) + (2)$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
(1) =& e_1'\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big]^{-1}\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\frac{\mu'''(x_{ni}^*, y, d)}{3!}a_n^3 \\
(2) =& e_1'\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big]^{-1} \\
&\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{b_n}K\Big(\frac{Y_i-y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i=d\} - \mu(X_i, y, d)\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

From Step 1 of Proof of Lemma 1 in Chiang, Hsu and Sasaki (2017), with Assumption 2 (i) (a) (b), (iii) and (iv), we have the common inverse factor

$$\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r'\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big]^{-1} \xrightarrow[x\times\xi]{p} \frac{(\Gamma^+)^{-1}}{f_X(0)}$$

uniformly in (y, d). It suffices to show that each of

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3) =& \frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\frac{\mu'''(x_{ni}^*, y, d)}{3!}a_n^3 \\
(4) =& \frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{b_n}K\Big(\frac{Y_i-y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i=d\} - \mu(X_i, y, d)\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

converges in probability to zero uniformly. We will divide the argument into the following four Steps.

Step 1

Under Assumption 2 (i)(a), (ii)(a)(b), (iii) and (iv)(a), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\frac{\mu'''(x_{ni}^*,y,d)}{3!}a_n^3\Big| \leq & \frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big|K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big|\Big|r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\Big|\Big|\frac{\mu'''(x_{ni}^*,y,d)}{3!}a_n^3\Big| \\ \lesssim & \frac{n}{na_n}\left\|K\right\|_\infty M a_n^3 \to 0.\end{aligned}$$

Step 2

We first bound the difference

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{na_nb_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)K\Big(\frac{Y_i-y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i=d\} \\ &- E\Big[\frac{1}{na_nb_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+ K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)K\Big(\frac{Y_i-y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i=d\}\Big].\end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show that each term converges in probability uniformly. Define for each $t=0,1,...,4$

$$\mathscr{F}_t = \{(y',d',x)\mapsto \delta_x^+(ax)^t K(ax)K(by'+c)\{d'=d\} : d\in\mathscr{D}, a,b\geq 0, c\in\mathbb{R}\} \qquad \text{and}$$

$$\mathscr{F}_{t,n} = \{(y',d',x)\mapsto \delta_x^+(x/a_n)^t K(x/a_n)K((y'-y)/b_n)\{d'=d\} : d\in\mathscr{D}, y\in\mathscr{Y}_1\}.$$

Note that for a fixed t, $\mathscr{F}_{t,n}\subset\mathscr{F}_t$ for all n. Fix any t, under Assumption 2 (iv), $\{x\mapsto K(ax): a\in\mathbb{R}\}$ is of VC Type class with measurable envelope $\left\|K\right\|_\infty$. By Proposition 3.6.12 of Gené and Nickl (2016), $x\mapsto (ax)^t|\mathbb{A}|\leq\mathbb{1}$ is of VC type class with measurable envelope 1 since $z\mapsto z^t\mathbb{1}\{z\leq 1\}$ is a mapping of bounded variations. Furthermore, $\{\mathbb{1}\{\cdot=d\}: d\in\mathscr{D}\}$ is of VC-subgraph class and therefore of VC type. Lemma A.6 of Chernozhokov, Chetverikov and Kato (2014) then implies that the class of their element-wise product $\mathscr{F}_t$ is of VC type with envelope $F_t=\left\|K\right\|_\infty^2$, i.e., there exist positive constants k, $v<\infty$ such that $\sup_Q N(\varepsilon\left\|F_t\right\|_{Q,2},\mathscr{F}_t,\left\|\cdot\right\|_{Q,2})\leq(\frac{k}{\varepsilon})^V$ for $0<\varepsilon\leq 1$ and the supremum is taken over the set of all probability measures on $(\Omega^x,\mathcal{F}^x)$. Corollary 5.1 in Chernozhokov, Chetverikov and Kato (2014) then gives

$$E\left[\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(f(Y_i,X_i,D_i)-E[f])\right\|_{\mathscr{F}_t}\right] = O_p^x(1).$$

Multiplying both sides by $(\sqrt{n}a_n b_n)^{-1}$, we have

$$E\Bigg[\sup_{(y,d)\in\mathscr{Y}_1\times\mathscr{D}}\Bigg|\frac{1}{na_nb_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)K\Big(\frac{Y_i-y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i=d\} \\ -E\Big[\frac{1}{na_nb_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)K\Big(\frac{Y_i-y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i=d\}\Big]\Bigg|\Bigg]=O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}a_nb_n}).$$

The result then follows from Markov's inequality and Assumption 3.

Step 3

We now want to control

$$\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\mu(X_i,y,d)-E\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\mu(X_i,y,d)\Big]$$

Since under Assumption 2 (ii)(a)(b), for any (y_1,d_1), $(y_2,d_2)\in\mathscr{Y}\times\mathscr{D}$, $|\mu(x,y_1,d_1)-\mu(x,y_2,d_2)|\leq M(x)(|y_1-y_2|+|d_1-d_2|)$, this implies that $\{\mu(\cdot,y,d):y\in\mathscr{Y}_1,d\in\mathscr{D}\}$ is of VC type class in lieu of Example 19.7 of van der Vaart (1998) and Lemma 9.18 of Kosorok (2008). We can then follow the same steps as in Step 2 to show

$$E\Bigg[\sup_{(y,d)\in\mathscr{Y}_1\times\mathscr{D}}\Bigg|\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\mu(X_i,y,d)-E\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\mu(X_i,y,d)\Big]\Bigg|\Bigg] \\ =O\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}a_n}\Big)$$

The desired result of the current step then follows from Markov's inequality and Assumption 3.

Step 4

Finally, we show that the two expectations above are asymptotically equivalent uniformly. Under Assumption 2 (i) (b), (ii) (a) (b), (iii), (iv) (a), calculations yield

$$E\Big[\frac{1}{na_nb_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)K\Big(\frac{Y_i-y}{b_n}\Big)\mathbb{1}\{D_i=d\}\Big]=f_{YDX}(y,d,0^+)+O(a_n)$$

$$E\Big[\frac{1}{na_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_i^+K\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)r\Big(\frac{X_i}{a_n}\Big)\mu(X_i,y,d)\Big]=f_{YDX}(y,d,0^+)+O(a_n)+O(b_n^2).$$

The big-oh terms are negligible asymptotically under Assumption 3. This result, along with results from Steps 2 and 3, concludes the proof. □

References

Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M.D., and Farrell, M. (2016a) "Coverage Error Optimal Confidence Intervals for Regression Discontinuity Designs," *Working paper.*

Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M.D., and Farrell, M. (2016b) "On the Effect of Bias Estimation on Coverage Accuracy in Nonparametric Inference," *Working paper.*

Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M.D., and Titiunik, R. (2014) "Robust Nonparametric Confidence Intervals for Regression Discontinuity Designs," *Econometrica,* Vol. 82, No. 6, pp. 2295–2326.

Card, D., Lee, D., Pei, Z., and Weber, A. (2016) "Inference on Causal Effects in a Generalized Regression Kink Design," *Econometrica,* Vol. 83, No. 6, pp. 2453–2483.

Chernozhukov, V. and Fernández-Val, I. (2005) "Subsampling Inference on Quantile Regression Processes," *Sankhya: The Indian Journal of Statistics,* Vol. 67, No. 2, pp. 253–276.

Chernozhukov, V., Fernandez-Val, I., Galichon, A. (2010) "Quantile and Probability Curves without Crossing," *Econometrica,* Vol. 78, No. 3, pp. 1093–1125.

Chiang, H. and Sasaki, Y. (2016) "Causal Inference by Quantile Regression Kink Designs," *Working Paper.*

Chiang, H., Hsu, Y.-C., and Sasaki, Y. (2017) "A Unified Robust Bootstrap Method for Sharp/Fuzzy Mean/Quantile Regression Discontinuity/Kink Designs," *Working Paper.*

Dong, Y. (2016) "Jump or Kink? Identifying Education Effects by Regression Discontinuity Design without the Discontinuity," *Working Paper.*

Frandsen, B.R., Frölich, M., and Melly, B. (2012) "Quantile Treatment Effects in the Regression Discontinuity Design," *Journal of Econometrics,* Vol. 168, No.2, pp. 382-395.

Giné, Evarist and Richard Nickl (2016) *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Models,* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Koenker, R. and Xiao, Z. (2002) "Inference on the Quantile Regression Process," *Econometrica,* Vol. 70, No. 4, pp. 1583–1612.

Kosorok, Michael R. (2003) "Bootstraps of sums of independent but not identically distributed stochastic processes." *Journal of Multivariate Analysis,* 84, no. 2: 299-318.

Kosorok, Michael R. (2008) *Introduction to Empirical Processes and Semiparametric Inference,* Springer: New York.

Li, Qi and Jeffrey Scott Racine (2008) "Nonparametric econometrics: theory and practice," Princeton University Press.

Pollard, David (1990) "Empirical processes: theory and applications," *NSF-CBMS regional conference series in probability and statistics,* Institute of Mathematical Statistics and the American Statistical Association.

Qu, Z. and Yoon, J. (2015) "Uniform Inference on Quantile Effects under Sharp Regression Discontinuity Designs," *Working Paper.*

Table 1: Coverage probabilities for the uniform treatment significance test and the treatment homogeneity test for the nominal coverage probability of 95%. The results are reported across alternative values of $\beta_1 \in \{0.00, 0.50, 1.00, 1.50\}$ while keeping the value of γ_1 at zero.The number of Monte Carlo replications is 2500, and the number of multiplier bootstrap resampling is also 2500.

		β_1	0.00	0.50	1.00	1.50
		γ_1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
$n = 500$	Significance		0.929	0.921	0.903	0.861
	Homogeneity		0.929	0.930	0.934	0.926
$n = 1000$	Significance		0.929	0.915	0.887	0.844
	Homogeneity		0.935	0.931	0.935	0.914
$n = 2000$	Significance		0.922	0.896	0.863	0.824
	Homogeneity		0.933	0.926	0.923	0.914
$n = 4000$	Significance		0.923	0.882	0.854	0.822
	Homogeneity		0.924	0.918	0.912	0.922

Table 2: Coverage probabilities for the uniform treatment significance test and the treatment homogeneity test for the nominal coverage probability of 95%. The results are reported across alternative values of $\gamma_1 \in \{0.00, 0.50, 1.00, 1.50\}$ while keeping the value of β_1 at zero.The number of Monte Carlo replications is 2500, and the number of multiplier bootstrap resampling is also 2500.

	β_1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	γ_1	0.00	0.50	1.00	1.50
$n = 500$	Significance	0.929	0.920	0.897	0.892
	Homogeneity	0.929	0.938	0.922	0.913
$n = 1000$	Significance	0.929	0.905	0.884	0.885
	Homogeneity	0.935	0.911	0.898	0.909
$n = 2000$	Significance	0.922	0.901	0.895	0.870
	Homogeneity	0.933	0.904	0.905	0.890
$n = 4000$	Significance	0.923	0.902	0.887	0.864
	Homogeneity	0.924	0.900	0.895	0.874